revising its standards to incorporate the changes required by the Commission's January 20, 1995 Order on Standards of Conduct.[3]

Any person desiring to be heard or to protest said filing should file a motion to intervene or protest with the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, 825 North Capitol Street, NE., Washington, DC 20426, in accordance with Rules 211 or 214 of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure (18 CFR 385.211 or 385.214). All such motions to intervene or protest should be filed on or before March 10, 1995. Protests will be considered by the Commission in determining the appropriate action to be taken, but will not serve to make protestants parties to the proceeding. Any person wishing to become a party must file a motion to intervene. Copies of this filing are on file with the Commission and are available for public inspection.

Lois D. Cashell,

Secretary.

[FR Doc. 95–4945 Filed 2–28–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717–01–M

[Docket No. RP95–166–000]

Pan-Alberta Gas (U.S.) Inc. Complainant v. Pacific Gas and Electric Company and Pacific Gas Transmission Company Respondents; Notice of Complaint

February 23, 1995.

Take notice that on February 16, 1995, Pan-Alberta Gas (U.S.) Inc. (PAG-US), submits for filing a complaint against Pacific Gas and Electric Company (PG&E) and Pacific Gas Transmission Company (PGT) (jointly, Respondents).

PAG-US complains that the terms on which PG&E recently offered to permanently release a ''package'' of two assignments of FTS–1 capacity on the PGT system (PGT Release Package) are unlawfully discriminatory and anti-competitive.

PAG-US argue that in its PGT Release Package, PG&E offered to permanently release (1) An unspecified quantity of capacity on the PGT System from Kingsgate, British Columbia to Malin, Oregon, and (2) a similarly unspecified quantity of separate, additional capacity on the system from Stanfield, Oregon [1] to Malin. As a condition of the release, PG&E required that, for each unit of Kingsgate to Malin capacity sought by a bidder, that bidder would have to agree to take 3.5 units of additional Stanfield to Malin capacity.

PAG-US argue that PG&E's mandatory bundling of this unrelated PGT capacity (1) Constitutes an unlawful tying arrangement, (2) amount, in effect, to an unlawful attempt by PG&E to collect a rate in excess of the as billed rate for its Kingsgate to Malin capacity, and (3) violates the requirements of Order No. 636 and PGT's tariff that conditions imposed on capacity releases be reasonable and nondiscriminatory.

PAG-US states that the Commission should (1) Set aside any capacity releases that may actually have been consummated on the discriminatory and anti-competitive terms of PG&E's January PGT Release Package, (2) require that, if PG&E still desires to release Kingsgate to Malin and Stanfield to Mailin capacity, it must do so on an unbundled basis, with neither block being mandatorily tied to the other, and (3) provide any additional relief which is deems appropriate in the circumstances.

Any person desiring to be heard or to protest said complaint should file a motion to intervene or a protest with the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, 825 North Capitol Street, NE., Washington, DC 20426, in accordance with Rules 214 and 211 of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure 18 CFR 385.214, 385.211. All such motions or protests should be filed on or before March 27, 1995. Protests will be considered by the Commission in determining the appropriate action to be taken, but will not serve to make protestants parties to the proceeding. Any person wishing to become a party must file a motion to intervene. Copies of this filing are on file with the Commission and are available for public inspection. Answers to this complaint shall be due on or before March 27, 1995.

Lois D. Cashell,

Secretary.

[FR Doc. 95–4946 Filed 2–28–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717–01–M

[Docket No. MG88–11–003]

Questar Pipeline Company; Notice of Filing

February 23, 1995.

Take notice that on February 14, 1995, Questar Pipeline Company (Questar) submitted revised standards of conduct under Order Nos. 497 *et seq.*[1] and Order Nos. 566 and 566–A.[2] Questar states that it is revising its standards to incorporate the changes required by the Commission's January 20, 1995 Order on Standards of Conduct.[3]

Any person desiring to be heard or to protest said filing should file a motion to intervene or protest with the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, 825 North Capitol Street, NE., Washington, DC 20426, in accordance with Rules 211 or 214 of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure (18 CFR 385.211 or 385.214). All such motions to intervene or protest should be filed on or before March 10, 1995. Protests will be considered by the Commission in determining the appropriate action to be taken, but will not serve to make protestants parties to the proceeding. Any person wishing to become a party must file a motion to intervene. Copies of this filing are on file with the Commission and are available for public inspection.

Lois D. Cashell,

Secretary.

[FR Doc. 95–4947 Filed 2–28–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717–01–M

Transactions, Order No. 566, 59 FR 32885 (June 27, 1994), III FERC Stats. & Regs. ¶ 30,997 (June 17, 1994); Order No. 566–A, *order on rehearing*, 59 FR 52896 (October 20, 1994), 69 FERC ¶ 61,044 (October 14, 1994); Order No. 566–B, *order on rehearing*, 59 FR 65707 (December 21, 1994); 69 FERC ¶ 61,334 (December 14, 1994); *appeal docketed sub nom. Conoco, Inc.* v. *FERC*, D.C. Cir. No. 94–1745 (December 13, 1994).

[3] 70 FERC ¶ 61,054 (1995).

[1] Stanfield is an intermediary point on the PGT system approximately halfway between Kingsgate and Malin.

[1] Order No. 497, 53 FR 22139 (June 14, 1988), III FERC Stats. & Regs. ¶ 30,820 (1988); Order No. 497–A, *order on rehearing*, 54 FR 52781 (December 22, 1989), III FERC Stats. & Regs. 30,868 (1989); Order No. 497–B, *order extending sunset date*, 55 FR 53291 (December 28, 1990), III FERC Stats. & Regs. ¶ 30,908 (1990); Order No. 497–C, *order extending sunset date*, 57 FR 9 (January 2, 1992), III FERC Stats. & Regs. ¶ 30,934 (1991), rehearing denied, 57 FR 5815 (February 18, 1992), 58 FERC ¶ 61,139 (1992); Tenneco Gas v. FERC (affirmed in part and remanded in part), 969 F. 2d 1187 (D.C. Cir. 1992); Order No. 497–D, *order on remand and extending sunset date*, III FERC Stats. & Regs. ¶ 30,958 (December 4, 1992), 57 FR 58978 (December 14, 1992); Order No. 497–E, *order on rehearing and extending sunset date*, 59 FR 243 (January 4, 1994), 65 FERC ¶ 61,381 (December 23, 1993); Order No. 497–F, *order denying rehearing and granting clarification*, 59 FR 15336 (April 1, 1994), 66 FERC ¶ 61,347 (March 24, 1994); and Order No. 497–G, *order extending sunset date*, 59 FR 32884 (June 27, 1994), III FERC Stats. & Regs. ¶ 30,996 (June 17, 1994).

[2] Standards of Conduct and Reporting Requirements for Transportation and Affiliate Transactions, Order No. 566, 59 FR 32885 (June 27, 1994), III FERC Stats. & Regs. ¶ 30,997 (June 17, 1994); Order No. 566–A, *order on rehearing*, 59 FR 52896 (October 20, 1994), 69 FERC ¶ 61,044 (October 14, 1994); Order No. 566–B, *order on rehearing*, 59 FR 65707 (December 21, 1994); 69 FERC ¶ 61,334 (December 14, 1994); *appeal docketed sub nom. Conoco, Inc.* v. *FERC*, D.C. Cir. No. 94–1745 (December 13, 1994).

[3] 70 FERC ¶ 61,054 (1995).